

THE
Journal of the Assam Research Society.

(KĀMARŪPA ĀNUSANDHAN SAMITĪ)

EDITED BY

RAI K. L. BARUA BAHADUR, B.L.,
PRESIDENT, KĀMARŪPA ĀNUSANDHAN SAMITĪ.
HONORARY SECRETARY, PROVINCIAL COIN CABINET, ASSAM, ETC.

Vol. IV.	JULY 1936.	No. 2.
-----------------	-------------------	---------------

Published by the Kamarupa Anusandhan Samiti, Gauhati.

Printed by DILIP RAI at the Nepali Press, Shillong

Annual Subscription Rs. 4.]

[Single Copy Rs. 1.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
SANKARĀCĀRYYA AND BUDDHISM IN ASSAM.	... (By R. M. Nath, B.E.) ... 31
TĪMGYADEVA AND VAIDYADEVA	... (By Nalini Nath Das Gupta, M.A.) ... 39
KĀLĀPĀHĀR AND THE KĀMĀKHYĀ TEMPLE	... (By R. M. Nath, B.E.) ... 42
BUDDHISM IN KĀMARŪPA AND SYLHET	... (By Jogendra Chandra Ghosh.) ... 47
THE HĀRALATĀ AND THE KĪCAKAVADHA	... (By D. Bhattacharyya) ... 49
THE MAHĀRĀJĀ OF KOCH-BIHAR	... (By K. L. BARUA) ... 50
A STRAY CANNON AT BANIYACHANG	... (By Pandit Padmanath Bhattacharyya Vidyavinod.) ... 52
THE HUMAN TAILS	... (By Dewan Singh Rongmuty B.A.) ... 54
THE ANCIENT GARO CALENDAR	... (By Dewan Singh Rongmuty B.A.) ... 55
KING DHARMAPĀLA OF KĀMARŪPA AS A POET	... (By N. N. Das Gupta M.A.) ... 56

AN APOLOGY.

The Publishers regret that owing to the serious and protracted illness of the Editor it has not been possible to regularly publish this Journal. The publication of the next issue will also be delayed.

SANKARĀCĀRYYA AND BUDDHISM IN ASSAM.

(BY. R. M. NATH. B.E.)

Kartikeya—the wargod—was reborn as Bhattapāda or Kumārila Bhattā to defeat the Buddhists and clear the path for Śankarācāryya to re-establish the Vedic religion—this is the view held by Mādhavācāryya in his “Śankar-Vijayam” (1). The shrewd Brahmin of Kāmarupa—himself a Vedic scholar,—became an ardent student of the Buddhist philosophy, and at last—under circumstances known to all—utilised his knowledge as a weapon in his anti-Buddhist propaganda तदेवमित्थं सुगतादधीत्य प्राघातयं तत्कुलमेव पूर्वं (2). He found an ardent supporter in Śudhanvan—a King of the Deccan—in whose court Buddhist scholars sustained a heavy defeat in disputation with Kumārila—and he (the King) issued an edict that his subjects should massacre every Buddhist, young or old, from the Himalayas to the cape Comorin, and whoever would neglect to carry out the orders would meet with a similar fate.

—आसेतोरातुषाराद्रे बौद्धानावृद्धबालकम् ।

न हन्ति यः स हन्तव्यो भृत्यानित्यन्वशान् नृपः ॥ (3).

This story may be a “mere poetic bombast”—as Mr. C. N. K. Aiyar, M.A., considers—(vide The three Great Ācāryyas—Śankarācāryya, Page 30). But whether the story is true or false, we are concerned only with the essence of it. Another view holds that “Gaurapāda” either belonged to or was under the influence of the Nāth-cult that had long ago been started to evolve a school effecting compromise between Hinduism and Buddhism, and Govindanāth or Govindapāda—the Guru of Śankarācāryya—though disciple of Gaudapāda—belonged to an extremist party.

(1) Vide Sankara Vijayam by Mādhava, Ch. I—52 and 55.

(2) Ibid—Chapter VII—101.

(3) Ibid—Chapter I—93.

This is why Gaudapāda's Kārikās, as Rai Bahadur Amarnath Roy observes, "Looked like attempting a synthesis between Mahāyāna Buddhism and the philosophy of Upanisads" (4). Śāṅkara imbibed the extremist spirit of his immediate Guru, and having the field already cleared could easily have a plain sailing (5).

(4) J. A. R. S. Vol. IV, No. 1—April 1936, Page 21.

(5) That Nāthism was a very old cult has been attempted to be shown by me in J.A.R.S. Vol. III—No. 4, January 1936, P.P. 104-108 and a reference was quoted from Śāṅkaravijyam Ch. IX, 80-84, where Śāṅkarācāryya was referred to an old story about Matsyendranāth and Gurakhnāth. It further appears that in the same book Chapter XV—stanza 28, footnote 334-337 (Quotation from Ananda Giri's Sankar Vijayan) a set of people came to Śāṅkarācāryya and told him that they were followers of the cult preached by such Siddhas as Satyanāth and others—

“श्री शैलादिकशैलेषु प्राप्य मन्त्रा-दिकान् शुभान् ।

सत्यनाथादयः सिद्धाः कृतार्थाश्चिरं जीवनः ॥

तेषां सम्पदेशेन तथा भूता वयं स्थिताः ॥”

It is very interesting to note that the “Pitha” Sree-Saila is mentioned as a holy place of the Naths even in the book “Kaulajñāna Nir-naya”—said to have been revealed by Matsyendranāth :—
[sixteenth Patala stanzas 5 to 7] :—

“श्री शैलश्च महेन्द्रश्च पीठ कामाख्य विश्रुतम् ॥

× × × ×

श्री शैलेनाम संसिद्धिमहेन्द्रे राजसं स्मृतम् ।

साध्विकं योगसंयुक्तो कामाख्यं पीठमास्मृतम् ॥”

and Satyanāth or Santnāth is a well known Nāth-Siddha.

It is also very interesting to note that Dr. B. M. Barua M.A. D. Litt of the Calcutta University has found in old Pali literature mention of three religious cults running side by side—(1) Brāhmana-Karana-Panthā (2) Buddha-Karana-Panthā and (3) Nātha-Karana-Panthā. Nātha-Karana-Panthā was among other aspects a “Guru-Karana-Panthā,” and the first instruction that Govindapāda gave to Śāṅkarācāryya was—“to worship the feet of the Guru is the greatest ‘Ācāra’ in the world” (Vide Śāṅkaravijyam Chapter V—101). It is not known who was the Guru of Gaudapāda. Śāṅkaravijyam states that Vyāsa's disciple was Sukadeva and Suka deva's disciple was Gaudapāda. This is only an imaginary statement. But the second component of the name “Pāda”—so common amongst the Nath Siddhas—and also the compromising spirit between Hinduism and Buddhism with a spirit of Guru-worship dominating in their principles are themselves very suggestive of either the direct relation with or influence of Nathism.—R.M.N.

Thus when Śankarācāryya began his active propaganda he declared in unequivocal terms that “ब्राह्मणान् ननु सुदुष्टमतस्थान दण्डयितुं-महमागत एव। नेतरानत”—(Chapter XV—Stanza 28, footnote 29)—“I have come here to punish only the Brahmins who are following the evil paths—and not others.” In his disputation with Batuk Nath—the Bhairava is also said to have told him (Chapter XV—stanza 28—footnote 7)—

ईत्यूक्तो भैरवः प्राह विप्रदण्डार्थमागतः ।
शंकरस्त्वं सदा पूज्यः सर्ववेदपदार्थभाक् ॥

Bhairava said,—“ I know you are Śankara, who have come to punish the Brahmins ”.

This, however, does not mean that Śankarācāryya did not hold “ Vicārā ” with the people of any other faith. Ānanda Giri gives a detailed account in his “ Śankaraviṣayam ” of different people with whom Śankarācāryya held discussions in his campaigns of philosophical victory.

Amongst others, there was a fat and strong built Buddhist who pleaded against “ Karma ” ततः सोगतः शंकरं पीनकायः प्रणम्याह— (Madhava, Chapter XV—28, footnote 51). And then again came a Buddhist—named Shavala—to discuss about the distinction between “ Jivātman ” and “ Paramātman ” —बोद्धस्ततस्तं शबलाख्यं एत्य प्रोवाच—(Ibid footnote 83). Then there was “ Vicāra ” with a Nihilist (शून्यवादी)—शून्यवादी ततो नृत्वा-गुरुं प्रोवाच शङ्करम् (Ibid) footnote—222).

The Tibetan works Pāgsām Jon Zān of Sumpa Khan-po and Kāhbāb Dun-dān of Lama Tārānāth also state, “ When Śankarācāryya, who, it is said, could see the God Mahadeva whenever he wished, came to Bengal, the elderly Buddhist Bhiksus wished to call the demigods who guarded Buddhism in other lands to their aid; but the youthful Buddhist Pandits not listening to their advice, held religious controversy with Śankara, and were defeated. They lost twenty-five endowed religious institutions together with their furniture and other properties and 500 Buddhist “ Upāsakas ” were converted to the creed of the “ Tirthikās ” (Brahmins). When Śankarācāryya sent his letter of challenge to Nalanda to hold a religious disputation, Dharmakīrti was

brought from the Deccan by King Probhasa " (7). Here it is said, Sankara was defeated, and a large number of people interested in the dispute became Buddhists, and after the death of Śankara some of his followers are also said to have embraced Buddhism.

Again in Orissa (Odivisa) one of Śankarā's disciples "defeated the Buddhist Pandit Kulīśa Śrestha and others in disputation, with the result that the Buddhist temples were destroyed by the Tirthikas and their endowed properties appropriated to the use of the latter". Rai Bahadur Amarnath Roy therefore, seems to be not accurate when he says that Śankarācāryya did not hold any "Vicāra" with any Buddhist (8).

But what all these meant? A religious reformer seldom comes with a view to put a barrage or a dam across a live current to stop it altogether, but like a clever engineer constructs some spurs or sausages to divert the current to adopt it to his own use. This has all along been corroborated by history and a shrewd man like Śankara could not have acted otherwise. It is therefore, that we find Śankara a clean shaven mendicant dressed in yellow or Gairik robes just like a Buddhist Bhikkshu, forming a 'Sanghā' of his disciples and establishing something like a Buddhist 'Vihara'—at least in four places, framing a rule that in each Math there should always be a Brahmācāri (not a Yati)—Achāryya—an exact copy of the "Buddha Bhikkshu". In his teachings also, we find him a Māyāvādin with a Buddhist Mahāyānist outer garb put on the inner skeleton of the Upanisada.

Rightly does the Anagarika Dharmapāla state (9)—"Unlearned critics not knowing the conditions that had existed outside India in the eighth century, naturally came to the conclusion that Buddhism had met its fate at the hands of such men like

Kumārila Bhatta and Sankara. They had no idea of the ruins wherein were buried evidences to show that in the eleventh century of the European era Buddhism was yet alive in the

(7) Vide "A note on the Antiquity of Chittagong by Rai Bahadur S. C. Das, C.I.E. in J.A.S.B. 1898, Pt I, Page 20.

(8) Vide J.A.R.S. Vol. IV—No. 1—page 21. It is very strange to note that in the recently published Visvakosha by N. N. Vasu—part II, page 585, Abhinavagupta is stated to have been a Buddhist philosopher of the 9th century A.D.—R.M.N.

(9) Life and teachings of Buddha, PP. 6-7.

Magadha Kingdom ; and the copper plate grants discovered at Sahet-mahet show that the famous temple at Sravasti was still under the occupation of the Buddhists at the time of Govinda Chandra. Śankara and Kumārila Bhatta may have waged polemical wars with Buddhist monks, but to prove that they were instrumental in the obliteration of Buddhism from its birth place, sufficient evidence of an antiquarian nature is not forthcoming." True it is, no religious reformer could ever attain a cent-per cent. success for his creed, and even Śrīkrishna with all his politics and prowess could not get a following even in Kamrupa.—It is therefore, I am afraid, inaccurate to pass a sweeping remark that —“Śankarācāryya swept Buddhism clear out of India” (10). This much may perhaps, be said without any fear of contradiction that when Śankarācāryya reorganised the Vedic religion, further active initiation into Buddhism received a set back.

Says the Anagarika Dharmapāla, “The Buddhism of the people of India was of native origin, the Gods of the Buddhist were the Gods of the Brahman Throughout the long reign of Buddhist Kings, the Brahman and the Sramans were the objects of devout charity (11). The chief disciples of the Thatāgata were high class Brahmins, the Presidents of the great convocations were Brahman Bhikshus, and Buddhist Kings had Brahman Purohits to officiate at their coronations. Even today in Siam, where a Buddhist King reigns, the ceremonies at the coronation are celebrated according to Brahmanical rites, and Brahman priests officiate” (12) In admitting this, of course, it must be admitted that fanatics and dogmatists there have been and there are in every religion, and dealing with the general history, their case cannot be taken into consideration.

But why then—one will naturally ask—is Buddhism not a very active cult in India now ? The reply is—“In the eleventh century, Buddhism found its dread foe in Bakhtiar-Khilji, the great Vandal, who destroyed the libraries of Nalanda and Odantapuri”. * * * “The great gulf that divided the two great families in India began after the invasion of India by Mahmud Gazni. Since that event the gulf became wider, because every successor

(10) J. A. R. S. Volume III, No, 4, Page 116—“Buddhism in Assam by Pandit Padmanath Vidyavinode.

(11) This was also the state of affairs in the court of Bhāskarvarman of Kāmarūpa as noticed by Hieun Tsiang.—R. M. N.

(12) Life and teachings of Buddha—Pages 7-8.

to the throne of the iconoclast was bound to continue the work of destruction". This is also corroborated by the Tibetan works mentioned above. 'In 1200 A. D. Pandit Śākya Śribhadra of Cashmir visited the great monasteries of Odantapuri and Vikramaśīla. He witnessed the destruction of those Viharas by the Turuska army and the wholesale massacre of the monks. He fled to a place called Jagadhala, in Otivisa (Orissa) when further ravages were being done to Buddhism in Magadha by the Turuskas. * * * Some of the Buddhist Pandits of Magadha fled towards Nepal, to the south west and south and also towards Arakan, Munad (Burma) and Kamboja (Cambodia) and other places. * * Towards the east, Buddhism spread more and more than before. After the downfall of Magadha most of the learned sages went towards the land of the Koki. (13).'

It may now be reasonably argued that if Muhammad of Ghazni laid his hands on the library of Nalanda of the Buddhists, he did not spare the temple of Somnath of the Hindus; but why is it that when the Hindus could remain in tact in spite of the onslaught, the Buddhists took to heels and fled to hills and dales outside India?

Nalanda, Odantapuri and Magadha were the chief—centres of the Buddhists, whereas Somnath was only one of the many temples of the many cults of Hinduism. Hindus could not think of any place to fly to, whereas the Buddhist priests had some kings of their own faith in distant countries under whom they could seek shelter.

But it cannot be said that all the Buddhists fled in a body—only a few did go away, but the common mass must have remained in their own homes; and gradually they became assimilated into

(13) What place is meant by this land of the Koki? In the same Tibetan book it is stated that one of the four sons of Bablasundar, a Buddhist King of Chittagong and Tippera, became the ruler of Nāngata—(the Hill tracts of Assam, Cachar and Tripura). These places are well known abodes of Kukis; and that a large portion of Sylhet also once formed the country of the Hankula and Tengkuri Kukis is a well known fact to us, through the courtesy of the learned compiler of 'Srihatter Iti-Vritta'.—vide 2nd Book—1st part—4th Chapter—page 58.—R. M. N.

“प्रतीच्यामुत्तरस्यान्व वक्रगा क्रोशिरानदी । दक्षिणस्यान्व पूर्वस्यां हाकला कौकिकापुरी ॥
पुत्तन्मध्यात् सरस्या या देहकरी कुकि कर्षिता ॥”

other neighbouring faiths. Lāmā Tārānāth says that "about this time, some foolish yogis who were followers of the Buddhist yogi Gauraksa (14) became Saivite Sannyasins".

Thus we find, in the unsettled period some Buddhists fled away, Some were converted into different faiths of Hinduism, some stuck to their faith as long as they could till gradually they were merged into the faiths of their neighbours—as they had none of their own faith to give them training and impetus.

[A culture lasting for centuries could not but leave a deep rooted impression in the minds of its own followers and exercise a great influence in the customs and manners of the neighbouring people of other faiths. Some of those Buddhists who became Saivites or followers of other faiths could not forsake the impression left on them by the century old faith; and one of the three "jewels" therefore, appeared as "Dharma Thākur"—demanding his Pujah under a banyan tree or near a bamboo cluster, later on taking Sitala Devi as his Sakti (15); and "Trināth Thākur" who is enjoying his "Sevā" even now-a-days unabated, was also perhaps evolved at that time as an emblem of the "Tri-Ratnas." Others who stuck to their old faith—compromised Hari as an evolution of the Buddha—"अनेक बुद्ध अवतारे हरि जन्मिले ए संसारे" (16)

As regards the influence on the neighbouring peoples, as has been stated above, perceptibly and imperceptibly it must have played its part—specially when Buddhism was a state religion for centuries. 'Math' system as already stated is a copy of Buddhist organisation, and 'Nām-ghar' of the Vaisnavas of the Assam Valley looks like an exact copy of a Buddhist Vihara.

(14) This Guraksa is perhaps different from 'Nath' Guraksa—the disciple of Matsyendranath. About this time, we find a reference to Nath Guraksa in another source. Chānd Bordāi, the court poet of Prithviraj, states in "Prithviraj Rāsu" that Prithviraj was engaged in a fight with Alha and Udal—two sons of Jasraj of the Chandel family. Udal was killed in the battle, when the spirit of Guru Gurakshanath appeared and took away Alha. This referred to Nath Guraksa, and Lama Taranath perhaps refers to one Buddhist Guraksha of a later period, who was sometimes known as Raman Bajra or Ananga Bajra. In this connection vide H. P. Sastri's—"Buddha Gān O Doha" preface page 16,—where also this confusion in identification prevails. Also vide K. L. Barua's Early History of Kāmrup page 327 where Buddha Guraksha is mentioned as the author of कामरूपे तंत्र ॥

(15) Modern Buddhism by N. N. Vasu, Page 151.

(16) Ibid page 132.

Sangha system, in some form or other, is a direct gift of the Buddhists, and very many social customs and observances peculiar to the Buddhists are noticeable still in our Hindu societies in some form or other.

This is only a natural course. Observance of Sunday—as the Sabbath day—is considered by some to be the influence of old ‘Mithraism’, observed even now by all Christians; and Thursday—the Muhammedan pre-Jummaday, coinciding with the Weekly-Lakṣmī Puja day, is perhaps not a chance coincidence. The worship of Satyapir, as Dr. Bhandarkar says, is a Hindu-Moslem compound (17), perhaps Muhammedan Tusha Sinni in Hindu form—having been first introduced in the reign of Hussain Shah. Mass worship by Kirtan—as preached by Chaitanya or Sankar Deva—is perhaps a copy of the Muhammedan system of Mass prayer.

Buddhist Sramans and Bhikshus lived in Kamrup even in the reign of Bhaskarvarman as stated by Hsien-Tsiang himself, and many took refuge in the hilly tracts in the 12th century as stated by Lānā Tārānāth. Of course, Buddhism was never a state religion in Assam; but nothing prevented the Bhikshus from preaching their religion and forming a following of their own how-so-ever limited it might have been. In the Buddhist-Tantric days, Kamrup—the old seat of Tantricism—was naturally a fertile field for propagating Buddhist ideas, and it is perhaps at this time that Lanka, Mahamaya, and Ouddiyana etc., became associated with Kamakhya and attained the distinction of “*Pithās*” and “*Upapithās*.” (18)

(17) Vide Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar's Presidential address in the First Indian Cultural Conference, April 1936, Page 13.

(18) ‘प्रथमं पीठं मूत्पन्नं कामाख्या नाम उच्यते। उपपीठस्थिता सप्तदेवीनां सिद्ध आलयम् ॥ २०

पूनः पीठं द्वितीयन्तु संज्ञा पूर्णांगिरि प्रिये। उड्डियान महापीठं मूपपीठं समन्वितम् ॥ २१

अथ त्रयोपपीठं उपपीठं समन्वितम्। पीठोपपीठं सप्तशेहं क्षत्रोपक्षत्रमेव च ॥

पीठाद्य देवतामांश्च शृणु पूजा विधिं प्रिये ॥ २२

ह्रीं श्रीं ह्रीं श्रीं पुलिन्दाईपाद. चम्पाईपाद, हिडिम्बाईपाद, महामायाईपाद ॥ २३

“कौलाज्ञान निर्णयः” अष्टम पटलः।

Pulinda—(present name Pulani), Champa—(present name Chapanalla) Mahamaya (present name—Mahamsi Thān)—are all in the Nowgong District near Lanka and Doboka, and they abound in old ruins shrouded in thick jungles with awe-inspiring hoary traditions about them. Hidimba or Dimapur with its Phallus like mushroom ruins may reveal unexpected facts in near future—as we find the place to have been connected by ancient direct routes—with Chapanalla, Lanka, Daboka and Mahamaya in one way, and Numaligarh, Deopani and Kasomari in the other way.—
R. M. N.

Existence of some form of Vajrayāna, Kalachkrayāna or some other schools of Buddhism in some parts of Assam in old days and traces of them even in the present days is therefore, not a wonder; and reasonably there are evident material for careful research in this line in the Province.



TIMGYADEVA AND VAIDYADEVA.

(BY NALINI NATH DAS GUPTA, M.A.)

The 13th. verse of the Kamauli Inscription of Vaidyadeva is as follows :—

*Etādṛṣe hari-harid-bhuvi satkṛtasya Śrī-Timgyadeva
nrpatervivikṛtiṁ nisamyā*

*Gauḍeśvarena bhūvi tasya nareśvaratve Śrī-Vaidyadeva
uru-kīrtirayaṁ niyuktah.*

(*Ep. Ind.* II, p. 351.)

This has been translated by Prof. Kielhorn thus :—

“The aforesaid renowned Vaidyadeva was appointed ruler by the Lord of Gauḍa in the room of Timgyadeva, who had been treated with honour in the East, and of whose disaffection the Lord of Gauḍa had heard.” (*Ibid.*, P. 355)

It has been generally concluded from this verse that Timgyadeva was a vassal of Rāmapāla, the father of the Lord of Gauḍa, Kumārapāla, whose general Vaidyadeva had originally been, and that the vassal revolted as soon as Rāmapāla died. I do not know if the term *vikṛtiṁ* (disaffection) as used in the above excerpt, carries withal the sense of vassalage, but the representation of Timgyadeva as an “illustrious one” (Śrī) and as a “*nrpati*” (king) of such a rank as was “treated with honour”, is not the usual one of a subordinate chief. A perusal of the more or less contemporary inscriptions of Kāmarūpa, for instance those of the *Paramabhaṭṭāraka Parameśvara Mahārājādhirāja* Dharmapāla-varma-deva, wherein we get expressions like “Śrī Gopāla”, “Śrī Harṣapāla”, “Rājā Śrī Dharmapāla,” etc., is also apt to bring home that the idea of Timgyadeva’s subordination is wide of the mark.

It has been well argued by MM. Padmanātha Vidyāvinoda that the expression “*paribhavaṁs-tām Kāmarūpa-śriyaṁ*” (“conquered the fortunes of Kāmarūpa”), as used of Jātavarman in the Belavo copper-plate grant of his grandson, Bhojavarman, of East Bengal, does not indicate that he (Jātavarman) conquered Kāmarūpa. But in case of Rāmapāla, we definitely know from the *Rāmacaritaṁ* of Sandhyākara-Nandin that Kāmarūpa came under his sway, and that the conquest was made for him by a certain Māyana :—

*Tasya jita-Kāmarup=ādi-viṣaya-vinivṛttau mān-sampādyah :
māhīmāna Māyana-nṛpa yata mānasya prajābhi-rakṣārtham. III 47.
(Mem. As Soc. Bengal, III, page 50).*

If Rāmapāla appointed anybody, other than the ruling prince who had been vanquished, to rule over Kāmarūpa as his vassal, it must naturally have been Māyana himself. Of Tiṁgyadeva's relation with Rāmapāla, we must keep in mind, we know nothing. Tiṁgyadeva doubtless came after Rāmapāla's governor, to assert independence in Kāmarūpa. The *Rāmacaritaṁ* also tells us that a king belonging to the Varma dynasty of the eastern country,—the allusion being in all likelihood to Bhojavarman,—propitiated Rāmapāla with large elephants, chariots and armour for his own protection. Yet we know for certain that Bhojavarman was *not* a feudatory, in any sense of the term, to the Pālas. Tiṁgyadeva's relation with Rāmapāla or his successor, Kumārapāla, might have been of a similar nature.

Rai K. L. Barua Bahadur seems to be in the right when he maintains that Tiṁgyadeva was a king of Kāmarūpa proper, although he is not explicitly mentioned as such in the Kamauli, inscription of Vaidyadeva (*Early History of Kāmarūpa*, pp. 148, 190 f.). It is likely that when the Pāla General, Vaidyadeva was busy in naval fighting in the waters of the south-eastern Bengal, probably against a Varma king, Tiṁgyadeva found it an opportunity to encroach upon the north-eastern part of the Pāla territory, but ere he could effect anything tangible. Kumārapāla despatched against him Vaidyadeva, who having marched speedily against him, succeeded to overthrow him.

It is difficult to divine when exactly Tiṁgyadeva, whose regnal period must have been a short one, came to the throne, for neither the chronology of the Pālas of Bengal nor that of the Pālas of Assam has yet been unquestionably settled. But one

may, without any great risk of error, place him in the second quarter of the twelfth century A. D.

It is idle to fancy that Vaidyadeva was allowed to use the imperial titles by Kumârapâla out of his affection to him (1). All that we may surmise is that when he was first made the king of Kâmarûpa, he owed some sort of allegiance to his former master, Kumârapâla. But within four years of his conquest of Kâmarûpa, we find him a full-fledged emperor bearing the titles of *Paramēśvara Paramabhattâraka* and *Mahârâjâdhirâja*. His Kamauli inscription makes mention of the "Kâmarûpa maṇḍala" within the "Prâggyotiṣa bhukti". The tract around the city called "Kâmrupa-nagara" in the second inscription of Dharmapâla must have been made a *maṇḍala*, and denominated as "Kâmarûpa-maṇḍala" by Vaidyadeva, who hailed from Bengal. This together with some other *maṇḍalas* constituted the *Prâggyotiṣa-bhukti*, the extent of which it is well-nigh impossible to determine at this time of day, but it is not improbable that it comprised the whole of what is generally known as the *Prâggyotiṣa* territory. Again, there must have been at least another *bhukti* to form Vaidyadeva's *rajya* or *deśa*. Thus it is evident that the mighty Vaidyadeva had, by the fourth year of his reign, made to bear the brunt of his rule over an extensive region covering the greater part of the modern Assam and the north-eastern parts of Bengal. It is, therefore, absurd to deny that Vaidyadeva was the king of the whole territory of Kâmarûpa (2).

In the Deopara inscription of Vijayasena of Bengal, occurs the expression "*Gaudendram-adravat-apâkrta Kâmarûpa-bhupam*". Keilborn translated it as "(Vijayasa) assailed the lord of Gauda (and) put down the prince of Kâmarûpa". But according to Mr. C. V. Vaidya, "*apâkrta Kâmarûpa-bhupam*" should be an adjective to "*Gaudendram*" (cf. *Early History of Kâmarûpa*, p. 196). Rai K. L. Barua Bahadur supposes that "Mr. Vaidya's interpretation may be correct" (ibid), but against this MM. Padmanâtha Vidyâvinoda says that "this would appropriate if the very king of Gauda conquered by Vijayasena was himself the conqueror of Kâmarûpa,....." (3). In other words, the allusion here would be to Râmapâla, if we accept Mr. Vaidya's interpretation. But apart from the fact that there is no historical

(1) *Kâmarûpa-sasanavali*, Introduction, p. 42.

(2) *J. A. R. S.*, III, Apr., 1935, p. 21 f.

(3) *Ind. Hist. Quarterly*, X, Sept. 1934, p. 598.

evidence of Vijayasena's vanquishing Rāmapala, I cannot bring myself to believe that the poet of the inscription could have employed such a peculiar language simply to intimate that Rāmapala was assailed by Vijayasena. Vijayasena, therefore, must be taken as to have measured swords with a king of Kāmarūpa, who may not improbably be Vaidyadeva himself (4)

(4) Cf. *Early History of Kāmarūpa*, p. 196.



KALAPAHAR AND THE KAMAKHYA TEMPLE.

(BY R. M. NATH B. E.)

A very strong tradition in the country runs to the effect that Kālapāhār — the Brahmin renegade iconoclast of Bengal—invasion the Koch territory and by defeating Naranārāin and his general Chilārāi caused serious depredations to the temple of Kāmākhyā ; and that Naranārāin and Chilārāi later on repaired the temple and brought it to its present shape. The *Pandas* of the temple point out some broken stone carvings and sculptures near the temple to the pilgrims and inspire their reverence for the deity and abhorrence for the notorious iconoclast who had originally been a Hindu but converted into Islamism by the Muhammadan Nawab of Bengal.

Sir E. A. Gaithas taken this story simply on the strength of tradition (*vide* History of Assam — 2nd Edition, page 54) ; but when analysed historically, it appears, there are grounds for suspecting the very truth of the tradition.

Historians are divided in their opinions as to the exact date of the alleged invasion of the Koch territory by Kālapāhār. One tradition has it that just after their return from the conquest of the Ahom and other eastern kingdoms, Naranārāin and his general Chilārāi straight off led another campaign against the Nawab of Bengal (*vide* Darrang Raj Vansavali — stanzas 490, 494-495), but were badly defeated by Sulaiman Kararani and his general Kālapāhār. Naranārāin escaped with his life, but

Chilārāi was taken as a prisoner. Another tradition runs that Sulaiman Kararani took the aggressive when Naranārāin had just returned from his victorious campaign in the east, and the latter being in an unprepared state was easily defeated by the ruler of *Gāur*. Rai Bahadur K. L. Barua, in his *Early History of Kamrup*, appears to favour this tradition when he says (pages 297-298) "unfortunately the valorous Bhuiyan Chiefs of the previous generation who had combined to resist such invasions were no longer in existence. They had been uprooted by Viśwa Singha and many of them had escaped to the Ahom territories. On the defeat of Chilārāi, therefore, there was none to check the Vandalism of the iconoclast Kālāpāhār. * * * The Muslim invasion and the sack of the Kāmākhyā took place about 1564 A. D. for in the next year Naranārāin rebuilt the Kāmākhyā temple."

Sulaiman Kararani became the independent ruler of Behar in 1555, and when Jalaluddin, the ruler of Bengal, was assassinated in 1564, he with the help of his brother Tajkhan, occupied the throne of Bengal too. Rajiblochan Roy—a young Brahmin Zamindar of Bengal fell in love with a daughter of Sulaiman, whom he married and became a Muhammādan. He wanted to remain in his community and sought help from the *Pandas* of Jagannath temple at Puri, when the latter, it is said, behaved very badly with him. He then took the surname of Kālāpāhār and took a vow of demolishing the images of the Hindu Gods that could not give him any protection -- his first wrath being naturally against the presiding deity of the Puri temple.

According to the Darrang-Raj-Vansavali, after finishing their eastern campaigns Naranārāin and Chilārāi paid a visit to the Kāmākhyā temple — which they found in a damaged condition. They wanted to repair the temple, but as Saturn was then reigning supreme in the Zodiac of Naranārāin's nativity, the idea was given up, but on the other hand, they led a campaign as stated above, against the Nawab of Bengal.

The author of the Darrang-Raj-Vansavali was an astrologer by caste, and he knew his art well. He had to find an explanation as to why Naranārāin — when he was too superstitious to undertake the repair of a temple was foolishly bold enough to wage a war with a new enemy knowing full well as a simple truth of astrology that the influence of Saturn lasted 12 years. He stated that Mercury was in the twelfth place (place of expenditure) and Dragonhead in the eighth place (place

of death) of the Zodiac, and they formed a sextile with Saturn to puzzle the brain of Naranārāin and lead him foolishly on to a war with the Nawab of Bengal. The result was inevitable—Naranārāin escaped with his life and Chilārāi was taken a prisoner;—the effect of the evil star apparently playing more havoc on Chilārāi than on its own native! In the prison, Chilārāi had a dream that as he came to war neglecting to repair the Kāmākhyā temple that had been damaged by the 'Bangāls' (vide stanza 514), he had incurred the displeasure of the Goddess, which was responsible for his defeat. After his release however, Chilārāi straight off repaired the temple and commemorated the event by a stone inscription on the wall of the temple. The inscription is dated 1565 A.D., and the building of the temple — (not repair) — "for the worship of the Goddess Durga" — is ascribed to Chilārāi without any mention of any damage having been done to it by Kālāpāhar or the Nawab of Bengal.

Naranārāin invaded the Ahom territory in January, 1563, (vide Ahom Buranjī, para. 69) when he defeated the Ahom king Khorā Raja. He remained at Gargaon for about a year (vide Darrang-Raj-Vansavali, stanza 375), and then he led a campaign of victory against the kings of North Cachar, Manipur, Jaintia, Sylhet, Khyrem, Tipperah and Dimarua, and then he came back to Pandu. Taking all the later affairs to have taken him only about a year at a very moderate calculation in those days of bad communication, Naranārāin could not have returned to Pandu till the last part of 1564 or first part of 1565.

Sulaiman got the throne of Bengal in 1564 A.D., and perhaps Rajiblochan also became Muhammādan in that year. If the first act of aggression by Sulaiman and Kālāpāhar was undertaken in 1564, Naranārāin and Chilārāi with all their best soldiers were at that time busy in Assam and the eastern kingdoms, and the Muhammādan invaders found it a very easy task to carry on their depredations. But why then Sulaiman left this master-less country that he conquered by his own act of aggression? If it is taken that Sulaiman invaded Koch-Bihar in the last part of 1564, when he found the country without any master, but on hearing of the return of Naranārāin and his redoubtable general and brother Chilārāi or finding "that the Koch King had collected his forces and was ready for reprisals and had perhaps also invited the Ahoms to his assistance" (K. L. Barua, page 298) took to his heels through fear and ran back to his country. This interpretation does very little

courtesy to the hero of Rotashgarh and Orissa who certainly knew the power of his adversary before he undertook an invasion at his own initiative. It is not a fact, though Rai Bahadur K. L. Barua puts it, that he returned back due to an insurrection in Orissa, for the latter took place in 1568 and not in 1564 or 1565.

Kālāpahār was a great hero, but Chilarāi was not less so ; on the other hand, he was a great statesman too ; he had only recently returned from a victorious campaign subjugating a powerful Ahom king of Assam, and several other kings of Cachar, Jaintia, Manipur etc. and brought with him hordes of gold and silver, weapons, elephants, horses etc., and had held a royal durbār with the chiefs of those kingdoms at Pandu. If Kālāpahār had led his invasion previous to the return of Naranārāin and Chilarāi—as may be inferred from the fact that they found the Kamakhya temple already damaged—then certainly without rushing on to the war all at once, while the evil star was shining strong, Chilarāi, a great statesman and warrior as he was, would certainly have availed himself of the help of his new allies and utilise his hordes of money and booty to give a stout fight to his adversary.

True it is, as Rai Bahadur Barua says, most of the valiant Bhuiyāns had been annihilated by Viswa Singha, but yet there were some like Protap Rai, Gabhur Khan and Sriram Khan's son who stood as powerful allies with Chilarāi in his campaign against the Ahom king as the latter had alienated the minds of the Bhuiyāns by many of his foolish acts—specially in connection with the elephant Kheda. It is this Sriram Khan's son who played a great part in defeating the Ahom king Khora Raja (vide Bhusan Dwija's Śankardeva Charita,—stanzas 376-377).

It further appears from history that after establishing his position in Bengal and Behar Sulaiman's first act of aggression was against Rotasgarh in 1565. Fatch Khan, the ruler of Rotasgarh, sought the help of Akbar the Emperor of Delhi. Sulaiman retreated, but in the meantime Akbar entered into an *entente* with the king of Orissa that if Sulaiman acted against the wishes of the emperor, the king of Orissa would invade Bengal. This enraged Sulaiman and in 1568 when Akbar was busily engaged in Chitore, Sulaiman invaded Orissa, and defeated Mukundadeva—the king of the country. At this time, Kālāpahār, who was working as the general of his father-in-law got an opportunity of feeding fat his ancient grudge and laid his hand on the image of the Puri temple. Being encouraged by this, it is said, Kālāpahār, later on damaged several other Hindu temples.

All the historians however, agree that Sulaiman invaded Koch-Bihar in 1568, and this is in accordance with Riyaz-us-Sala-tin. According to this, "Sulaiman subjugated the outlying parts of Koch-Bihar and was besieging the capital when he heard of an insurrection in Orissa, and so abandoned the siege". (Gait, Page 54).

Colonel Shakespeare—perhaps anxious to respect the local tradition...states in his History of Upper Assam (Pages 24-25) that in 1568 Sulaiman invaded the western portion of Koch-Bihar, and Kālāpāhār destroyed the temple of Kāmākhyā. It is however, not stated when this destruction was set right by Chilarāi, and if the stone inscription of 1565 had any bearing on this. Kāmākhyā was situated on a high hill practically on the eastern boundary of Koch-Bihar kingdom on the North bank of the Brahmaputra, and it was perhaps impossible for Kālāpāhār to come up to the temple when his soldiers were exerting all their energies only on the western part of the country.

It therefore, appears that in 1564-65, Sulaiman had no time to invade Koch-Bihar, as this is also not borne out by any account of any Muhammedan historian;—and being a superstitious man, Naranārāin could not launch a war of his own initiative when he was under an evil star, and Chilarāi, a veteran general and a great statesman as he was, could not have hastened to a war against a new enemy without making adequate arrangements with his many new allies. The story of any invasion of 1564-65 therefore, appears to be unfounded.

In 1568, as already stated, Sulaiman did take the aggressive, but as he got a chance against Orissa—his avowed enemy—he at once went back without doing any serious damage to Koch-Bihar. If any temple was damaged, it must have been on the western portion or near about the capital of the kingdom—very likely the temple of the Goddess Kamateswari—which the Muhammedans did not spare (vide Social History of Kamrup, Vol. II, Page 46).

The story of Kālāpāhār—destroying the temple of Kāmākhyā—therefore, appears to have no historical support, and is perhaps simply the outcome of the stories told by some Bengali relatives of the *Pandas* of various depredations caused to many temples by Kālāpāhār in that province; or perhaps the story of the damage done to the Kamateswari temple has by stages been linked with the Kāmākhyā temple.



BUDDHISM IN KĀMARŪPA AND SYLHET.

[BY JOGENDRA CHANDRA GHOSH.]

A controversy is going on as to whether there was Buddhism in Kāmarūpa and Sylhet (1). Let us see if we can throw any new light towards the solution of this question. We shall take up the case of Sylhet first.

There is no denying the fact that the neighbouring district of Tippera was a great centre of Buddhism. We do not know what geographical, political or social barrier there was, which prevented Buddhism from penetrating a little to the north in the district of Sylhet. On the other hand, we find that people from Bengal and Behar went to Sylhet and settled there. It is a well-known practice that the people of one place migrating to another name their new settlement after their old residence. There existed three small kingdoms in Sylhet, viz., Magadha, Gauda and Lāuda (2). The names of these kingdoms indicate that people from these old provinces settled in Sylhet. This explains how Sylhet, although politically under Assam, ethnologically still forms a part of Bengal (3). Of these three countries Magadha and Gauda are too well-known to require any identification. But what old province is represented by Lāuda. We think it to be a corruption of Rādha (Rādha = Lāda = Lāuda). It is very interesting indeed that an aboriginal tribe called Rādha still exists in Sylhet, (4) and also in Mayūrabhañja on the border of Rādha country. We invite the attention of the ethnologists to this interesting point.

Now if people from the distant province of Magadha could settle in Sylhet, it will not be at all reasonable to think that people from the adjoining district of Tippera could not go to Sylhet. It has been proved without any vestige of doubt that Buddhism existed in Magadha, Gauda and Rādha. The ethnological identity of the people of Bengal and Sylhet shows that the majority of the people of the latter place migrated from the former. It

1. *J. A. R. S.*, vol. IV, p.p. 18-22.

2. *Srihatter Itivrtta*, vol. I, pt. II, *khanda* II, ch. I. p.p. 1-2.

3. *J. A. R. S.*, vol. IV, p. 20.

4. *Srihatter Itivrtta*, vol. I, pt. I, ch. VII, 69. They are also called Kushiyaṛi i.e., growers of sugar-cane.

will not stand to reason to say that only the Hindus from Magadha, Gauda and Rādha migrated to Sylhet, and not the Buddhists. On the other hand, as the people of Bengal and Behar were mostly Buddhists, they must have migrated in greater proportion than the Hindus. So the evidence of Ethnology goes to disprove the theory that Sylhet was a forbidden land to the Buddhists.

We shall now try to see if any positive trace of Buddhism can be found in Sylhet. Dr. N. K. Bhattacharya, in his *Iconography of Buddhist and Brahmanical Sculptures in the Dacca Museum*, (p. 25, Plate IV), gives the following description of an image of Lokanātha :—

“An image of Lokanātha in *octo-alloy* metal, 2' 8" × 11". It is exactly like the figures published in Foucher's *Iconographic Buddhique*, Vol. I, plate IV, p. 106, Nos. 2 and 3. The god stands on a lotus. He has a lotus with a long stalk in his left hand and he blesses mankind with his right hand. His clothing reaches down to the ankle and not to the knee, as is usually seen in these old images. Locks of wavy hair fall on his shoulders. Amitābha in miniature is represented on his crest.

The image is apparently very old. It is in a good state of preservation but is much worn at all the sharp points. Four seals are attached to its back containing, in all probability, the Buddhist creed “*Ye Dhamma*” etc. But the letters are too worn to be decipherable. The style of the script is cursive and of the form prevalent in Eastern India during the 8th-9th century A. D. Discovered at Bandarbar, Sylhet.” Dr. Bhattacharya further remarks (Addenda, p. 270) :—“The image of Hevajra described below is probably the first of its kind discovered in Bengal. It was dug out in a village of the Dharmanagara sub-division of the Tippera State. The plains of Dharmanagara merge in the north in the plains of the district of Sylhet and possibly, the image found its way to Dharmanagara through the latter country. The *octo alloy* Lokanātha from Sylhet (p. 25, Plate IV) may be remembered in this connection.”

Do they not conclusively prove that Buddhism existed in Sylhet in the 8th-9th century, if not earlier ?

As regards Kāmarūpa, if Tāranātha is to be believed, Buddhism existed in that country as early as Aswaghosha. Before he took up the Buddhist faith, he is said to have visited as far as

Kāmarūpa and defeated his Buddhist opponents there. (Ind. cult., vol. III. p. 133). This, no doubt, goes against the 'certificate' of Yuan Chawng. But if we take the statement of the famous Chinese traveller to refer to the capital of Kāmarūpa only, there will, we hope, be no discrepancy.

THE HĀRALATA AND THE KĪCAKAVADHA.

(BY D. BHATTACHARYYA.)

I wish to point out one or two inaccuracies in the interesting paper of Mr. S. C. Goswami on "Some Sanskrit Manuscripts found in Kāmarūpa" published in the *Journal of the Assam Research Society*, Vol. III, No. 4. The writer believes that his "list contains the names of only a few typical works composed by Kamrupi Pandits and not yet published or known to scholars".

Mr. Goswami's list includes the *Hāralatā* (a code on Smṛti) of Aniruddha Bhaṭṭa and the *Kīcakavadha Kāvya* of Mahākavi, Nitidharma. The former is evidently a Ms. of the well-known Smṛti work published in 1909 in the Bibliotheca Indica. The author Aniruddha Bhaṭṭa was the celebrated *guru* of Ballālasena a Bengal king of the 12th century A. C.

In the last verse of the *Hāralatā* Aniruddha calls himself a resident of Viharapataka on the banks of the Ganges. His other work *Pitṛdayitā* has also been published in Sanskrit Sahitya Parisad Series of Calcutta. From the colophons of the two works it appears that the author was a Cāmpahattīya Brāhmaṇa of Bengal. With regard to the *Kīcakavadha*. I think, the *Kāvya* is not different from the *Kīcakavadha* published by the Dacca University in 1929. The name of the author in the Dacca edition, however,

appears as Nitivarman instead of Nitidharma as read by Mr. Goswami. The Kāvya has been edited with the commentary of Janārdanasena. Another commentary by Sarvānanda Nāga is also available in Mss. Both the commentators, as their names suggest, belonged to Bengal. Dr. S. K. De, the editor of the poem concludes in his Introduction that Nitivarman "flourished at a period anterior to the 11th century A. D. in the court of an unknown prince who ruled, if not in Bengal, probably in the adjoining territory of Kalinga". Thus the *Hāralatā* and the *Kīcakavadha* are neither unpublished works, nor their authors are Kamrupi Pandits as stated by Mr. Goswami. *

The *Hārāvali*, another work mentioned in the list of Mr. Goswami has already been pointed out by Rai Bahadur Amarnath Ray to be a lexicon from the pen of Puruṣottamadeva, a Bengali Buddhist writer of the 11th century A. C. (see *J.A.R.S.*, Vol. IV No. 1, p. 24).

* The "unknown prince" may have been a king of Kāmarūpa. (Ed. J. A. R. S.)



THE MAHĀRĀJĀ OF KOCH-BEHAR.

(BY K. L. BARUA).

Some weeks ago the young prince of Koch-Behar, His Highness Mahārājā Jagaddwipendra Nārāyan Bhup Bahadur was invested with the powers of a Ruling Prince on his attaining

majority. His Highness is the twentythird Mahārājā of Koch-Bihar but actually he is thirteenth in direct descent from Viśwa Singha the founder of the dynasty, who became king of Kāmārūpa during the first quarter of the sixteenth century. The genealogy is shown below :—

Viśwa Singha	
I	
Nara Nārāyan	
I	
Lakshmi Nārāyan	
I	
Mahi Nārāyan	
I	
Jagat Nārāyan	
I	
Rūp Nārāyan	
I	
Kharga Nārāyan	
I	
Dhairjendra Nārāyan	
I	
Harendra Nārāyan	
I	
Śibendra Nārāyan	
I	
Narendra Nārāyan	
I	
Nripendra Nārāyan	
I	
Jitendra Nārāyan	
I	
Jagaddwipendra Nārāyan	

Alas, it is now a far cry from Assam to Koch-Bihar but till the beginning of the seventeenth century the kingdom of Kāmārūpa, ruled over by Parikshit Nārāyan, the nephew of Lakshmi Nārāyan, included the entire Assam districts of Goalpara and Kamrup and half of the district of Darrang besides parts of the Bengal districts of Mymensing and Rangpur. It was within these districts that Parikshit Nārāyan and his brother Bali Nārāyan

offered the stoutest resistance to the Moghuls. Even after the surrender of Parikshit Nārāyan, his subjects in Goalpara and Kamrup, led by some brave and patriotic leaders, continued guerilla warfare for a long time and at last, with the help of the Ahoms, drove out the Moghuls from Kamrup. In spite of repeated attempts afterwards the Moghuls failed to take possession of Kamrup which came under Ahom rule. Three branches of the Koch-Bihar ruling family are still extant in Assam and these are the families of the Rajas of Darrang, Bijni and Beltola. The great Assamese religious reformers Śankardev, Dāmodar Dev and Mādhav Dev were honoured and patronized by king Narnārāyan in Koch-Bihar itself. A galaxy of Assamese poets, grammarians, mathematicians, astronomers, astrologers and authors of *Smṛti* works gathered round the court of Narnārāyan. The famous temple of Kāmakhya, for which Assam is well-known throughout the Hindu world, was rebuilt by Narnārāyan whose statue is still enshrined there. Another great Hindu temple in Assam, that of *Mādhava* at Hājo, was built by king Raghudev, father of Parikshit Nārāyan. The history of Assam is thus closely bound up with the history of the rulers of the dynasty founded by Viśwa Singha. Assam offers her felicitations on His Highness Mahārāja Jagaddwipendra Nārāyan's assumption of the duties of a Ruling Prince and hopes that he will not forget the old associations of his Royal House with Assam and particularly the glories of Kāmarūpa under his illustrious ancestor King Narnārāyan. He may be interested to learn that Chilā Rāi, the brother and Commander-in-Chief of King Narnārāyan, is still regarded as a national hero and the Chilā Rāi *utsab* is still observed all over the Assam Valley to commemorate his military exploits. The name of this hero may have been forgotten within Koch-Bihar itself but it is still remembered in Assam with pride.

A STRAY CANNON AT BANIYACHANG.

(BY PANDIT PADMANATH BHATTACARYA VIDYAVINOD.)

In my article on the Ruins in Laur, published in the last issue of this Journal, I have given an account of the kingdom of Baniyachang. There I have mentioned the name of Gobinda Chandra—an ambitious and warlike prince of the Baniyachang Raj family—who, by the middle of the seventeenth century, conquered Laur and in course of time became ruler of his paternal kingdom of Baniyachang as well. He considered himself powerful enough to defy the authority of the Emperor of Delhi and so became engaged in warfare with the Muhammadans.

It was probably Gobinda Chandra who, in order to protect the capital—Kasba Baniyachang—from the invasion of the Mussalmans surrounded it with a rampart and a moat—which are still visible—though damaged very much. On the eastern part of the rampart stands now the Police Station : and there is to be seen here a small cannon—which it is said, was some time ago discovered from the bottom of the almost silted up moat nearby.

This cannon is 3 cubits long and 1 foot in circumference : the diameter of the hole is about 2 inches. The hinder part of it is a slender stalk about a foot in length, which we might term as its 'tail'.

So far as my experience goes, I have not seen any cannon with 'tail' in Sylhet or in any other place in Bengal. But I saw this sort of cannons at Sibsagar—in the Kutchery compound—which are however far bigger in size. My inference, therefore, is that this was obtained from the Ahom kings by Gobinda Chandra. The Brahmaputra Valley was accessible from Laur by the foot of the Garo Hills and even now, I think, country boats reach the mighty Brahmaputra by that way : and the cannon—small and so easily portable—was brought into this valley by boat.

Gobinda Chandra who was an enemy of Mussalmans, had probably heard of the prowess of the Ahom kings—his contemporaries—who had vanquished the Muslims in several engagements and so it was quite probable that he approached the Ahoms for help and got this cannon.*

The dates of the Ahom cannons in the Sibsagar Kutchery compound vary from 1590 Sak (=1668 A.D.)** to 1615 Sak (=1693) : and this was about the time when Gobinda Chandra was engaged in warfare with the Muhammadans

* I have called it "a solitary cannon" as none else has yet been discovered : who knows but others like it may in course of time be similarly found out ? It is therefore probable that a good number of such cannons was got from the Ahoms.

** This was the time of Udayaditya : but guns and gunpowder had evidently been in use before this time. According to Tavernier (who visited India by the middle of the seventeenth century), it was thought that the Assamese invented guns and powder (*Travels in India*, Book III. Ch. XVII).

THE HUMAN TAILS.

A GARO FOLKTALE.

(BY DEWAN SINGH RONGMUTY, B.A.)

Countless ages long gone by, human beings possessed long tails at the mid-bottom of their buttocks just as the *langur* monkeys or cows have nowadays. The human tails were as long and tapering and bushy at the end as the tails of the *langur* monkeys or cows. Both men and women had tails which, clothes then being unknown, partially served as covering for their nakedness.

One day a man lost his tail in an accident. The tailless man began to tell the tale of his tail. He harangued the people, saying, "Behold, I have lost my tail. While I was sitting on a rock at the foot of an overhanging boulder, with my tail spread out behind, a piece of stone fell on it and severed it at its root. I picked up the detached tail and found that it was of no use for me in any way. At first I felt its loss very bitterly and wept loud and long. I saw much blood issuing out of the remaining root of my tail. I chopped off the remaining root of my tail with my flint chopper to the level of my anus and applied some healing herb over the wound. The bleeding stopped. Lo, the wound is now getting perfectly cured as well, leaving little trace of my having a tail at all. Now I feel perfectly at ease without my tail. I am none the worse for being deprived of my tail. I rather rejoice that I have been freed from the physical encumbrance of my tail which served me no indispensably useful purpose."

The harangue was listened to with rapt attention by the audience. In a few days some began to cut off their tails at the bottom to see how they should feel without their tails. Their wounds were cured by the application of certain healing herbs. Before long, tail-cutting became the fashion of the day, although the more conservative elements kept their tails intact for a longer period of time. In course of time, cutting-off of tails began to be in vogue just as the boring of ears for the purpose of hanging earrings is common now-a-days among the Achyks (i.e., the Garos). Children were deprived of their tails. Some even practised the cutting-off of tails of their children at birth. This merciless war on human tails continued unabated.

The human tails served as a medium of keeping up the balance of the body while a person walked or ran. When the tails were cut off, the power of keeping up the balance of the body in running or walking was transferred to the hands and the upper part of the nape,

Ultimately, cutting-off of tails became a custom in the primitive society of our ancestors. In course of ages it happened that children began to be born without tails and those few that were born with tails were immediately deprived of them. Auman beings having tails became rare, and ultimately were hardly seen. We are the surviving descendants of those ancestors who were ron tailless.

THE ANCIENT GARO CALENDAR.

A GARO FOLKTALE.

(BY DEWAN SINGH RONGMUTY, B.A.)

When the great patriarch Bone-Nirepa-Jane-Nitepa for the first time cleared jungle for Jhum cultivation on the hill of Sohkadam (in the modern Garo Hills), there was no way of ascertaining the alternating seasons of the year. It was he who, as the first settler on the hills and the first jhum cultivator, invented a calendar to mark the round of seasons, which the ancient Achyks (i.e., the Garos) adopted.

This was the first calendar among mankind. According to this calendar, a week consisted of nine days and the names of week days were as follows :—

- | | | |
|---------------|--|-----------------|
| 1. Naryngbal. | | 2. Mechobal. |
| 3. Aebal. | | 4. Grisho. |
| 5. Airo. | | 6. Gabyngsho. |
| 7. Abesho. | | 8. Samytcho and |
| 9. Chigytcho. | | |

One full year consisted of ten months according to this calendar. Each month indicated the nature of seasons that marked the rolling year as well as man's seasonal occupation during the year. One year was divided into months as follows :—

Names of ancient Achyk months.	Approximate English equivalent.	No. of days.
1. Ah-okkhari ...	3rd November to 17th December.	45
2. Wahchengkhari ...	18th December to 26th January.	40
3. Galmakhari ...	27th January to 22nd February.	27
4. Bandoni ...	23rd February to 30th March.	36 or 37

Names of ancient Achyk months.	Approximate English equivalent.	No. of days.
5. Phalynkhari ...	31st March to 27th April.	28
6. Wasosyn ...	23th April to 2nd June.	36
7. Badri ...	3rd June to 8th July.	36
8. Saljongkhari ...	9th July to 13th August.	36
9. Rasonkhari ...	14th August to 18th September.	36
10. Jakgytchakhari ...	19th September to 2nd November.	45

KING DHARMAPĀLA OF KĀMARŪPA AS A POET.

(BY N. N. DAS GUPTA, M. A.)

Śri Vārdha Paramēśvara Paramabhaṭṭāraka Maharajādhiraja Śrīmat Dharmapāla-Varma Deva, who belonged to the dynasty of Brahmapāla, was, it is well known, one of the most celebrated kings of Kāmarūpa. Amongst his various qualities set forth in his two copper-plate inscriptions discovered, the second plate, otherwise known as the Puṣpabhadra inscription, says that " In his mouth always resided both Bhagavati and Sarasvati " (*Early History of Kāmarūpa*, p. 336), and that he was the '*Kavi-cakravāla : cuḍāmaṇi*'. That he really practised poetry is demonstrated by that the first eight verses of this inscription were his own composition.

Vajravarmā, the progenitor of the Varma dynasty of East Bengal, is also described as 'a poet and the most learned among, the erudite' in the Belavo copper-plate grant of his great-grandson Bhojavarmā (Ep. Ind. XII, p. 42; J. A. S. B., 1914, p. 127). This must not be conjectured as wholly an empty boast of the royal panegyrist, for the *Subhāṣitāvalī* of Vallabhadeva of Kāśmīra is found to contain a verse of a Vajravarma under *Dūti-preṣanam* (ed. Peterson and Durgaprasada, 1896, pp. 199-200, v. 1184) and without question he is the Vajravarma of the Varma dynasty of East Bengal.

Likewise, the anthology of the Bengali Śrīdhara-Dasa, *Saduktikarṇāmṛta*, preserves to us no fewer than ten verses of one Dharmapāla (ed. MM. Rāmāvatāra Śarma, Punjab Oriental Series, No. XV, 1933, Introduction, P. 63 No. 162). One of these verses is under *Proṣita-bhartṛk-avastha* (p. 106, II, 57. 1.)

another under *Svairinīpralapaḥ* (p. 113, II, 67. 2). No famous old poet bearing the name of Dharmapāla is known in the History of Sanskrit literature. Dharmapāla, the Buddhist celebrity of Nālandā and the *guru* of Hiuen Tsang, could not possibly have composed these verses, highly erotic as they are in character. The emperor Dharmapāla of Gauḍa is nowhere delineated as a poet. And the conclusion is, therefore, irresistible that Dharmapala of Kāmarūpa, who figures as a poet in his inscription, is the author of all these verses contained in the *Saduktikarṇamṛta**

* It may be added here that a verse of one Harṣa-pāla-Deva is quoted in the anthology, *Kavindravacana-samuccaya* (Ed. F. W. Thomas, pp. 47-48). This Harṣa-pāla-Deva may not improbably be indentified with the father of Dharmapāla-Deva, and in the first copper-plate inscription of the latter, the former has been described as being favoured by the goddess of learning also (cf. *Early History of Kāmarūpa*, p. 333, App III).

EARLY HISTORY OF KĀMARŪPA.

From the earliest times to the end of sixteenth century.

Demy 8vo. 352 pages.

With 25 illustrations on superior art paper.

BY

THE HON'BLE RAI K. L. BARUA BAHADUR, B.L.

Cloth Bound - - - - Rs. 7 per copy

Popular Edition, paper cover - " 5 " "

To be had of :-

Messrs. B. N. DEY & Co., Booksellers, Shillong.

" Chuckerverty Chatterji & Co., Ltd.,

15, College Square, Calcutta.

Punjab Sanskrit Book Depot, Said Mitha Bazar, Lahore.

Oriental Book Agency, 15, Shukrawar, Poona City.

FURTHER OPINIONS ON THE ' EARLY HISTORY OF KĀMARŪPA "

DR. B. A. SALETORÉ M.A., Ph.D., D. PHIL.—I have gone through your valuable book and cannot but admire your patience and skill in unravelling the early history of a province which has preserved its antiquities in tact. * * * This critical and most complete account of early Kāmarūpa based as it is on all available sources of information, is a distinct contribution to the history of ancient India. * * * Your remarks on Tantrism (pp. 156 seq.) are highly interesting. Deep erudition and balanced judgment mark this most remarkable achievement of yours.

MR. H. E. STAPLETON, M.A.—“I have seldom read a more helpful and suggestive history. It is in this respect a most pleasant improvement on another “History of Assam” which I found so full of obvious mistakes, when it appeared, that I had to decline to review it for the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

* * * * *

“You will gather from what I have written how extremely interesting I have found your book, especially as I was able to consult it while preparing my lecture for the Royal Asiatic Society. It was of particular assistance to me when discussing Karnasuvarna, and I mentioned in my lecture what an outstanding piece of work I considered your book to be and how pleasant it was to find the President of the Anusandhan Samiti (which kindly some years ago made me one of its Honorary members) publishing a book of such striking historical importance.”

NOTICE

KĀMARŪPA ANUSANDHAN SAMITI GAUHATI

The Kāmarupa Anusandhan Samiti or the Assam Research Society has a collection of old historical relics, such as inscribed stones and images cannons, cannon-balls, swords, potteries *pathis*, royal costumes coins, etc. The premises of the Samiti, situated on the southern bank of Digbali Tank, Gauhati, remains open from 7-30 to 9-30 A.M. and 3 to 7 P.M. on working days; from 3 to 7 P.M. on Sundays and on Doljatra, Lakshmipuja, and the anniversaries of Damodar Deb Sankar Deb, and Madhab Deb. The Samiti remains closed on the following occasions:—Sri-pauchami, Maghbihu, Bahagbihu Id-duz-zaha, Maharam, Janmāstami, Durgapuja Kalipuja, Christmas Eve, New Year's Day, King-Emperor's Birth day and Sivaratri.

Information which may lead to the recovery of any historical relic or article will be thankfully received.

D. GOSWAMI.

Honorary Secretary,

Kāmarupa Anusandhan Samiti.